

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C70-9213 RSM

SUBPROCEEDING NO. 17-03 RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS IN  
LIMINE

This matter is before the Court on motions in limine filed by the Upper Skagit Indian Tribe and Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians in advance of the March 21, 2022 bench trial in this subproceeding. Dkt. #236<sup>1</sup> (Upper Skagit); Dkt. #237<sup>2</sup> (Stillaguamish). Stillaguamish has opposed Upper Skagit's motions in limine. Dkt. #240.<sup>3</sup> The Tulalip Tribes have opposed Stillaguamish's motion to the extent it seeks relief limiting Tulalip's argument and presentation

<sup>1</sup> Dkt. #22459 in *United States v. Washington*, Case No. C70-9213RSM (the "*Main Case*"). Throughout, the Court provides citations to the docket of the *Main Case* the first time a filing is cited. Thereafter, citations are only to the docket of this subproceeding.

<sup>2</sup> Dkt. #22460 in the *Main Case*.

<sup>3</sup> Dkt. #22465 in the *Main Case*.

1 of evidence at trial. Dkt. #239.<sup>4</sup> And, finally, the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community has also  
2 opposed the motions. Dkt. #241.<sup>5</sup>

3 After briefing was complete, Upper Skagit filed a notice partially withdrawing its motion.  
4 Dkt. #250.<sup>6</sup> Upper Skagit withdrew numbers two, three, five, six, and seven of its motions in  
5 limine. The remaining motions in limine seek to exclude testimony by Dr. Friday, incorporating  
6 the arguments of its earlier motion to exclude, and to exclude evidence which was before Judge  
7 Boldt at the time of *Final Decision #1*. Dkt. #236. The Court has previously addressed these  
8 issues in the context of the parties' motions for summary judgment and determined that the issues  
9 are better resolved during trial. Accordingly, and for the same reasons, the Court again denies  
10 the requests without prejudice and will address them during trial, if necessary.

11 Stillaguamish has also partially withdrawn its motions in limine. Dkt. #254.<sup>7</sup>  
12 Stillaguamish's remaining motion in limine requests that the Court prevent Tulalip from offering  
13 evidence or making argument that is inconsistent with the 1984 Stillaguamish-Tulalip Settlement  
14 Agreement. Dkt. #237 at 11–12. Stillaguamish itself notes that motions in limine are generally  
15 superfluous in bench trials, as do the responding tribes. Dkt. #237 at 3; Dkt. #239 at 1–3; Dkt.  
16 #240 at 3. For this reason alone, the motion is appropriately denied without prejudice at this  
17 time. Additionally, Tulalip notes that Stillaguamish's requested approach would be burdensome  
18 and would breed numerous disputes that disrupt the presentation of evidence. Tulalip, in the first  
19 instance, should be responsible for honoring its obligations under the prior settlement agreement.  
20 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Stillaguamish's request without prejudice and will address the  
21 issue during or after trial, if necessary.

---

22  
23 <sup>4</sup> Dkt. #22464 in the *Main Case*.

<sup>5</sup> Dkt. #22466 in the *Main Case*.

<sup>6</sup> Dkt. #22483 in the *Main Case*.

<sup>7</sup> Dkt. #22493 in the *Main Case*.

1 Having considered the motions, the briefing of the parties, and the remainder of the  
2 record, the Court finds and ORDERS that Upper Skagit Indian Tribe's Motions in Limine (Dkt.  
3 #236) is DENIED without prejudice and that Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians' Motions in Limine  
4 (Dkt. #237) is DENIED without prejudice.

5 Dated this 18<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2022.

6  
7 

8 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ  
9 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24